

REMARKS

I. Summary of Office Action

In the Office Action mailed March 12, 2010, the Examiner rejected claims 13, 17, 19-22, 25, 27-32, 36, 39-40, 52-53 and 55 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Susskind, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0046366 (hereinafter Susskind). Claim 56 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Susskind.

Claims 15-16, 18 and 33-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Susskind in view of Paroz, U.S. Patent 6,587,125 (hereinafter Paroz).

Claims 24 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Susskind in view of Cao, U.S. Patent 6,782,550 (hereinafter Cao).

Claims 26 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Susskind in view of Venkatraman et al., U.S. Patent 5,956,487 (hereinafter Venkatraman).

II. Status of Claims

Pending are claims 13, 15-22, 24-36, 38-41, 52-53, and 55-56.

In this response, dependent claims 13, 27, 52, 53, 55 and 56 have been amended to clarify the subject matter of the present application.

III. Response to 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections of Independent Claims

The present application is directed to a system providing remote access and control of a media device (i.e. DVR) through a “web portal configured to provide a variety of online services comprising email, news and web search capability.” In an example embodiment, an Application Programming Interface (“API”) generates on the “web portal” an “integrated presentation” that

is “distinctive to the web portal” (Specification, para. 16 & 162). The API enables a flexible approach across different web portals to communicate with the DVRs through integrated presentations distinctive to the web portals.

Independent claims 13, 27, 52, 53 and 55 have been amended to make clear that a web portal is “configured to provide a variety of online services comprising email, news and web search capability.”

A. Independent Claims 13, 27, 52, 53 and 55 are Allowable Over Susskind As Susskind Does Not Disclose A “Web Portal” Supersite

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected independent claims 13, 27, 52, 53 and 55 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Susskind.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 13, 27, 52, 53 and 55 are allowable because Susskind fails to disclose a “web portal configured to provide online services comprising email, news and web search capability” with an “API” to form “integrated presentations that are distinctive to a web portal” as called for by the independent claims. In particular, Applicants’ specification describes the “web portal” as “a web ‘supersite’ that provides a variety of online services.” Specification, para. 91. Well known “web portal supersites” are AOL, Google, Yahoo, MSN, Lycos, Altavista, a variety of different websites that offer web services such as search, news and email services. (see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Web_portal; http://webopedia.com/TERM/W/Web_portal.html.)

In contrast, Susskind neither discloses nor suggests a web portal “supersite” with “one or more integrated presentations” that are “formed by the API” to be “distinctive to the web portal.” Susskind only teaches a particular website “www.sony.com,” not the claimed web portal “supersite” (Susskind, para. 35). Sony.com is Sony Corporation of America’s corporate website dedicated to promote Sony products and services. Sony.com is not a “supersite” web portal like

Google, MSN, Lycos or Yahoo that combines online sources of information in the claimed “integrated presentation” to provide services like news, web searching and email. Sony.com is not a web portal, but rather is a corporate website dedicated to promoting Sony products and services.

As such, Susskind does not anticipate Applicants’ claimed “web portal.” Because Susskind only discusses a single website, it does not disclose a web portal nor provide the use of an API to interface different types of integrated presentation for web access portals such as Google or Yahoo.

B. Susskind Also Does Not Disclose An “API” or “Integrated Presentations” formed by the “API”

Susskind also does not disclose or suggest “one or more integrated presentations distinctive to the web portal.” The claimed “integrated presentation” combines information from different “third-party online sources of information and services.” Specification, para. 11. The specification teaches the claimed “API” that “enables clients” to “request and to obtain the integrated presentation at the client user interfaces in unique arrangements distinctive to the local environment of the web portal.” Specification, para. 16. In contrast, Susskind makes no mention or suggestion of an “application programming interface” or “API.” Because Susskind does disclose different web portals with different integrated presentations, it does not address the problem of Applicants’ present claims, much less anticipate Applicants’ solution.

In light of the above, Susskind fails to anticipate “receiving one or more integrated presentations formed by the API” where “each of the integrated presentations including the data extracted to replicate a corresponding interface of the digital video recorder, wherein each of the one or more integrated presentations are distinctive to the web portal,” as recited in the

independent claims. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 13, 27, 52, 53 and 55 as amended are in condition for allowance.

IV. Response to 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections of Dependent Claims

Based on the discussions above, Applicants submit that independent claims 13, 27, 52, 53 and 55 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants submit that each of the dependent claims 15-22, 24-26, 28-36, 38-41 and 56 are allowable for at least the reason it depends ultimately from an allowable claim.

V. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that, in view of the remarks above, each of the pending claims 13, 15-22, 24-36, 38-41, 52-53, 55 and 56 are allowable. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests withdrawal of the current rejections. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (312) 913-2134 with any questions or comments.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 14, 2010

/George I. Lee/
George I. Lee
Reg. No. 39,269